### GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

| GEF ID: | 6940 |
| Country/Region: | Lao PDR |
| Project Title: | Sustainable Forest and Land Management in the Dry Dipterocarp Forest Ecosystems of Southern Lao PDR |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund |
| GEF Agency Project ID: | 5448 (UNDP) |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective(s): | Multi Focal Area |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | $130,000 |
| Co-financing: | $54,740,013 |
| Project Grant: | $10,879,174 |
| Total Project Cost: | $65,749,187 |
| PIF Approval: | Council Approval/Expected: October 01, 2014 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | Expected Project Start Date: |
| Program Manager: | Ulrich Apel |
| Agency Contact Person: | Johan Robinson |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion</th>
<th>Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligibility</strong></td>
<td>1. Is the participating country eligible?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Letter dated August 6, 2014. Cleared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Availability</strong></td>
<td>3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the STAR allocation?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

1 Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion</th>
<th>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement (FSP)/Approval (MSP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the focal area allocation?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes.</td>
<td>Cleared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Cleared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Cleared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Cleared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• focal area set-aside?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes for SFM incentive.</td>
<td>Cleared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Alignment</td>
<td>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes.</td>
<td>Cleared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country’s national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes.</td>
<td>Cleared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek(s) to address, sufficiently described and</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes.</td>
<td>Cleared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion</th>
<th>Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Not fully. Please include in Table B under component 2 an outcome that covers the intended work on HCVFs. In the respective PIF text, please outline by whom and how the mentioned activity of identification and setting aside HCVFs will be done and whether this will include the development of a HCVF toolkit (e.g. the HCVF toolkit for Vietnam) to allow identification of HCVFs in the national (or provincial) context. 8/25/2014 UA: Yes. Has been adequately addressed. Cleared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Not fully. GEBs are being described but the CO2 mitigation estimate needs to be entered into Table F. 8/25/2014 UA: Figures has been entered. In the future, please provide only numerical figures in Table F; additional explanations can be provided in a footnote. Cleared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Criteria</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion</td>
<td>Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>benefits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to section A2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Not fully. Risk 4 on financial constraints is formulated in an unclear way and questions the objective of component 3. Please revise. 8/25/2014 UA: Has been revised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Is the <strong>project consistent and properly coordinated</strong> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13.             | Comment on the project’s **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**.  
• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.  
• Assess the project’s strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.  
• Assess the potential for | 08/19/2014 UA: The three issues have been adequately explained in the PIF. The work on HCVF in Lao PDR is considered innovative. Refer to page 11 f. |                                                          |

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Secretariat Comment At PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion</th>
<th>Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scaling up the project’s intervention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Please clarify indicative co-financing by ADB. As 85% of the co-financing is coming from ADB, please provide additional information on how this will be confirmed at CEO endorsement. 8/25/2014 UA: Clarification provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: Yes. PPG is requested within thresholds. The PPG request is recommended for CEO approval in line with PIF clearance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Criteria</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹</td>
<td>Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</td>
<td>Cleared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&amp;E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Responses</td>
<td>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• STAP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Convention Secretariat?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Council?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other GEF Agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat Recommendation</td>
<td>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</td>
<td>08/19/2014 UA: No. Please address clarification requests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLEASE CORRECT: Table B: Typo in the figure for Project Management Costs (PMC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table D: Agency fees do not add up to the indicated total.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table D: Requested SFM incentive is &gt; 50% of STAR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table E: Requested SFM incentive is &lt; 50% of STAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Criteria</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion</td>
<td>Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/25/2014 UA: Yes. All clarification requests have been adequately addressed. The PIF is technically cleared by the PM and may be included into an upcoming WP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</td>
<td>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Date(s)</td>
<td>Additional review (as necessary)</td>
<td>August 19, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional review (as necessary)</td>
<td>August 25, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.